

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 1-30 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 8, 14, 23, and 27 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 14, and 27 are sought to be amended. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1, 3, 6-8, 12-14, 17, 18-23 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,652,412 to Lazzouni *et al.* (hereinafter "Lazzouni"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

To anticipate a claim of a pending application, a single reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1397 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The exclusion of a claimed element from the single source is enough to negate anticipation by that reference. *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

With regards to independent claim 1, Lazzouni does not teach or suggest every element of Applicants' claimed invention. For example, Lazzouni does not teach or suggest at least the claimed element of:

a processor coupled to the memory storage unit and configured to receive data associated with a handwritten notation applied to a printed page and an electronic image of an area of the printed version of the page near the notation, the electronic image including a printed passage, to identify a corresponding passage in the electronic version of the page and to create an electronic notation based on the received data and associated with the corresponding passage.

Unlike the present invention, Lazzouni does not teach or suggest “a processor ... configured to receive ... an electronic image of an area of the printed version of the page near the notation, the electronic image including a printed passage, to identify a corresponding passage in the electronic version of the page and to create an electronic notation based on the received data and associated with the corresponding passage.” To the contrary, Lazzouni teaches a pen that makes visible markings on encoded paper. *Lazzouni*, col. 4, lines 52-53. “The encoded paper ... is encoded with narrow lines which define pixels.” *Lazzouni*, col. 4, lines 10-12. The visible markings are traced by the tip of the pen and “[s]imultaneously, the absolute position of the tip of the pen on the surface of the paper is determined by optically reading a pattern of prerecorded pixels associated with the surface of the paper.” *Id.* at lines 56-62. The microprocessor processes and records the position information and controls communication with a host computer. *Id.* at lines 31-33. Thus, unlike the present invention where the processor receives an electronic image that includes a printed passage, identifies a corresponding passage in the electronic version of the page, and creates an electronic notation based on the received data and associated with the corresponding passage, Lazzouni teaches that the microprocessor receives the position information and processes and records the position information.

With respect to Applicants’ independent claim 8, Howard does not teach or suggest at least the following elements:

a writing utensil to apply a notation to the printed page, the writing utensil including a scanner positioned to scan a surface of the printed page as the notation is being applied to the printed page, the surface of the printed page including printed text corresponding to a part of the electronic version of the printed page;

wherein the processor includes a port to receive from the writing utensil stroke data associated with a notation applied by the writing utensil and an electronic image of an area of the printed page associated with the applied notation, and is configured to create an electronic notation based on the stroke data and associated with the corresponding part of the electronic version of the printed page.

Unlike the present invention, Lazzouni does not teach or suggest that the surface of the printed page includes printed text corresponding to a part of the electronic version of the printed page. Instead, as indicated above, Lazzouni teaches that the encoded paper has a prerecorded pattern of pixels which contain encoded position information to permit the absolute position of the pen tip to be determined simultaneously with writing. Lazzouni, col. 4, lines 10-12, lines 56-62; col. 6, lines 35-39.

Lazzouni also does not teach “wherein the processor includes a port to receive ... an electronic image of an area of the printed page associated with the applied notation, and is configured to create an electronic notation based on the stroke data and associated with the corresponding part of the electronic version of the printed page.” As indicated above, Lazzouni teaches obtaining position information, not an electronic image of an area of the printed page that includes printed text.

With respect to independent claim 14, Lazzouni does not teach or suggest at least the following elements:

applying a handwritten notation with a writing utensil to a page that includes a printed passage with which the handwritten notation is associated;

simultaneously capturing stroke data associated with the handwritten notation and scanning a portion of the associated printed

passage with a scanner connected to the writing utensil to create a scanned image; and

correlating the captured stroke data with a particular portion of an electronic version of the page based on the scanned image.

For at least the same reasons indicated above, Lazzouni does not teach "... a page that includes a printed passage ...", "scanning a portion of the associated printed passage ... to create a scanned image", or "correlating the captured stroke data with a particular portion of an electronic version of the page based on the scanned image."

With respect to independent claim 23, Lazzouni does not teach at least the following elements of:

create an electronic notation in response to received data associated with a handwritten notation applied to a printed version of a page and a received electronic image of a passage identifier indicative of a printed passage on the page; and

indicate an association between the electronic notation and a corresponding passage of the electronic version of the page based on the received electronic image.

As indicated above, Lazzouni does not teach an "a passage identifier indicative of a printed passage" and therefore cannot teach "a received electronic image of a passage identifier indicative of a printed passage on the page" or "indicat[ing] an association between the electronic notation and a corresponding passage of the electronic version of the page based on the received electronic image."

With respect to independent claim 27, Lazzouni does not teach or suggest at least the following elements:

a writing utensil having a writing tip to selectively dispense a writing medium onto a printed page for creating a notation and to capture stroke data associated with the notation, the writing utensil including a scanner positioned immediately above and outward from the writing tip to scan an area of the printed page near the notation as the notation is being

applied to create an image, the scanned area including a printed passage;
and
a processor coupled to the writing utensil to identify a correlation
between the stroke data and the image.

As indicated above, Lazzouni does not teach a printed passage on the printed page, and therefore cannot teach “to scan an area of the printed page near the notation as the notation is being applied to create an image, the scanned area including a printed passage” or “a processor ... to identify a correlation between the stroke data and the image.”

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8, 14, 23, and 27, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 2-7, 9-13, 24-26, and 28-30, respectively) are not anticipated by Lazzouni. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1, 8, 14, 23, and 27, and the claims that depend therefrom, respectively.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner, on page 6 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 2, 4, 5, 9-11, 15, 16, 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,652,412 to Lazzouni in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,050,490 to Leichner *et al.* (hereinafter “Leichner”). Applicants respectfully disagree. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 9-11, 15, 16, and 24-26 depend from independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 23, respectively, and are patentable over Lazzouni for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Leichner does not teach or suggest the features missing from Lazzouni. In fact, Leichner teaches away from Applicants invention by placing the pen tip and scanner at the opposite ends of the pen to prevent a user from simultaneously scanning while obtaining position data. *Leichner*, col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 10. Furthermore, Leichner teaches that “using the identification code, optical character recognition can be employed to automatically process data actually written upon a page **14** or **20** *without the requirement of scanning fields on the preprinted page or form*” *Leichner*, col. 4, lines 43-49. Thus, with Leichner there is no need to simultaneously scan an area of page while obtaining position data for the handwritten notation. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 9-11, 15, 16, and 24-26.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Crystal D. Sayles

Crystal D. Sayles
Senior Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
Registration No. 44,318
(703) 633-6829

Dated: January 21, 2005

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1470, Alexandria, VA, 22313 on.

1-21-05
Date of Deposit
RIB Rachael Brown
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence
RIB 1-21-05
Signature Date